

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the drawings so as to address the objections raised by the Examiner.

#### ***I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-10 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)***

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Seigo (JP 09-281440). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to a two view display with adjustable viewing windows and angles between views of the display. (See, e.g., Spec., p. 6, Ins. 18-24). This is accomplished by applying a split in the rows (as shown in Figs. 8(a)-8(d)), in order to decrease the visibility of the barrier and the pixel arrangement. (See, e.g., Spec., p. 10, Ins. 11-13). Furthermore, the dividing of the white pixels into multiple portions in the horizontal direction and multiple portions in the vertical directions, results in an increase in the horizontal pitch and the corresponding window separation angle. (See, e.g., 11, Ins. 19-27; and Fig. 9(a)). This results in the horizontal direction of the pixel being larger than the vertical direction of the pixel, resulting in larger angles.

In order to better clarify such distinctions, applicants have amended claim 1 to recite how the parallax elements are positioned in relation to at least one of the first pixels and at least one of the second pixels in a same row as and next to the at least one of the first pixels such that light from the first pixels is directed to the first display area by the parallax element and light from the second pixels is directed to the second display area by the parallax element, and an arrangement of the parallax element in the each row being shifted to the parallax element in a next row by half

the pitch of the parallax element in a row direction. Moreover, claim 1 as amended now recites how a size of a row direction of the pixels is defined to be larger than a size of a column direction of the pixels so as to increase an angle, which is defined by the size and formed by a first view direction to the display device and a second view direction to the display device.

As seen most easily from the figures, Seigo does not teach or suggest the above recited arrangement of the parallax element and the first and second pixels. This makes sense as the purpose of the invention in Seigo is to allow for high resolution in a stereoscopic display, but the pattern arrangement (e.g., Fig. 6 of Seigo) would not be able to account for the variable angles and windows accomplished by the present invention as claimed. (See, e.g., Figs. 9(a)-9(c)).

For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that Seigo does not teach or suggest a two view display as recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, claims 2-10 each depend from claim 1 either directly or indirectly, and may be distinguished over the reference for at least the same reasons.

## **II. CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, all claims 1-10 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: November 19, 2008

The Keith Building  
1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 621-1113